

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JAMES L. BROOKS,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-2343 JAM EFB P

12 vs.

13 EDWARD S. ALAMEIDA, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42
17 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 1, 2009, plaintiff filed a document styled “motion for reconsideration,”
18 which the court construes as a motion for discovery sanctions against defendants. Plaintiff
19 appears to contend that counsel for defendants has not made available to plaintiff the complete
20 contents of his central file, nor has counsel for defendants provided plaintiff with defendant
21 Runnels’ responses to plaintiff’s request for interrogatories, notwithstanding the facts that
22 counsel for defendants represented to the court that such discovery would be provided to
23 plaintiff, and that the court relied upon those representations in its April 30, 2009 order denying
24 plaintiff’s motions to compel discovery responses.

25 ///

26 ///

1 Defendant are ordered to respond to plaintiff's motion. Defendants shall file their
2 response no later than seven calendar days from the date of this order.

3 Dated: June 25, 2009.

4 
5 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26